Expéditeur : le BUREAU INTERNATIONAL

PCT

NOTIFICATION DE TRANSMISSION DE COPIES DE LA TRADUCTION DU RAPPORT D'EXAMEN PRELIMINAIRE INTERNATIONAL

(règle 72.2 du PCT)

Destinataire :

RICHARD Patrick
c/o Brevatome
3, rue du Docteur Lancereaux
F-75008 Paris
FRANCE

Date d'expédition *(jour/mois/année)* 09 décembre 2004 (09.12.2004)	
Référence du dossier du déposant ou du mandataire B 14009.3 PR	**NOTIFICATION IMPORTANTE**
Demande internationale n° PCT/FR2003/001025	Date du dépôt international *(jour/mois/année)* 02 avril 2003 (02.04.2003)
Déposant COMMISSARIAT A L'ENERGIE ATOMIQUE etc	

1. **Transmission de la traduction au déposant.**

Le Bureau international transmet ci-joint copie de la traduction en langue anglaise qu'il a faite du rapport d'examen préliminaire international établi par l'administration chargée de l'examen préliminaire international.

2. **Transmission d'une copie de la traduction aux offices élus.**

Le Bureau international notifie au déposant qu'une copie de cette traduction a été transmise aux offices élus suivants qui exigent la traduction en question:

AZ, CH, CN, CO, GH, KG, KP, KR, MK, MZ, RO, RU, TM

Les offices élus suivants ont renoncé à l'exigence selon laquelle la transmission doit être effectuée à cette date; ils recevront une copie de cette traduction du Bureau international seulement à leur demande:

AE, AG, AL, AM, AP, AT, AU, BA, BB, BG, BR, BY, BZ, CA, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DZ, EA, EC, EE, EP, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MA, MD, MG, MN, MW, MX, NI, NO, NZ, OA, OM, PH, PL, PT, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, TJ, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, YU, ZA, ZM, ZW

3. **Rappel concernant la traduction dans la ou l'une des langues officielles de l'office ou des offices élus.**

Il est rappelé au déposant que, lorsqu'une traduction de la demande internationale doit être remise à un office élu, cette traduction doit comporter la traduction de toute annexe du rapport d'examen préliminaire international.

Il appartient au déposant d'établir la traduction en question et de la remettre directement à chaque office élu intéressé (règle 74.1). Voir le volume II du Guide du déposant du PCT pour de plus amples renseignements.

Bureau international de l'OMPI
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Genève 20, Suisse

n° de télécopieur+41 22 740 14 35

Fonctionnaire autorisé

Beate Giffo-Schmitt

n° de télécopieur+41 22 338 87 20

Translation

PCT/FR2003/00102

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference B 14009.3 PR	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/FR2003/001025	International filing date (*day/month/year*) 02 avril 2003 (02.04.2003)	Priority date (*day/month/year*) 05 avril 2002 (05.04.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC G01C21/16		
Applicant COMMISSARIAT A L'ENERGIE ATOMIQUE		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.

☐ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).

These annexes consist of a total of _____ sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the report
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand	Date of completion of this report
28 octobre 2003 (28.10.2003)	02 August 2004 (02.08.2004)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP Facsimile No.	Authorized officer Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/FR2003/001025

I. Basis of the report

1. This report has been drawn on the basis of (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to the report since they do not contain amendments.*):

☐ the international application as originally filed.

☒ the description, pages 1-15, as originally filed,
pages _____, filed with the demand,
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____,
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____.

☒ the claims, Nos. 1-18, as originally filed,
Nos. _____, as amended under Article 19,
Nos. _____, filed with the demand,
Nos. _____, filed with the letter of _____,
Nos. _____, filed with the letter of _____.

☒ the drawings, sheets/fig 1/1, as originally filed,
sheets/fig _____, filed with the demand,
sheets/fig _____, filed with the letter of _____,
sheets/fig _____, filed with the letter of _____.

2. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages _____
☐ the claims, Nos. _____
☐ the drawings, sheets/fig _____

3. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/FR 03/01025

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-18	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-18	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-18	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO 00/36376 A (ABE HIROSHI; MUTO KAZUTAKE (JP); TOKIN CORP (JP)) 22 June 2000 (2000-06-22)

D2: US-B-6 208 936 (MINOR ROY R ET AL) 27 March 2001 (2001-03-27)

D3: US 5953683 A (PER KROGH HANSEN ET AL) 14 September 1999 (1999-09-14)

D3 has not been cited in the international search report. D3 has already been cited in the present application.

2. Objections with regard to inventive step.

2.1 The present application does not meet the conditions stipulated in PCT Article 33(1), since the subject matter of claims 1 and 14 does not involve an inventive step as defined by PCT Article 33(3).

2.1.1 D1, which is considered to be the prior art closest to the subject matter of claim 1, describes (the references between parentheses apply to this document):

a device for detecting the orientation of a solid (claim 1, line 1) including:

- an angular position sensor outputting a measured value representative of the orientation of the solid (40, figure 3);
- a means for generating test data which provide an estimated orientation of the solid (501, figure 3 & claims 30, 33),

2.1.2 Consequently, the subject matter of claim 1 differs from the device described in D1 in that there is a means for changing the estimated orientation of the solid by comparing the measured value and the test data.

2.1.3 The problem that the present invention is intended to solve can therefore be considered to be that of improving the accuracy of the estimated orientation.

2.1.4 The solution proposed in claim 1 of the present application is not considered inventive (PCT Article 33(3) for the following reasons:

according to the description provided in D3, the means for changing the estimated orientation of the solid by comparing the measured value with the test data (column 11, lines 1 to 45) has the same advantages as those mentioned in the present application. Consequently, for a person skilled in the art, including this feature in the device described in D1 constitutes a routine measure for solving the stated problem.

2.1.5 The same argument applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the subject matter of corresponding independent claim

14 (corresponding method), which consequently does not involve an inventive step either.

2.2 Dependent claims 2 to 13 and 15 to 18 contain no feature which, when combined with the features of any one of the claims to which they refer, defines subject matter that complies with the requirements of inventive step of the PCT, for the following reasons:

2.2.1 The technical features in claims 2 and 3 are described in D3 (figure 11). The features of dependent claims 2 and 3 have already been used for the same purpose in D3. It is obvious for a person skilled in the art to apply these features, with a corresponding effect, in an orientation-detecting device according to D1 and thereby arrive at an orientation-detecting device according to claims 2 and 3.

2.2.2 The technical features in claims 4 and 5 are described in D1 (figure 3, 403/404 and 401/402).

2.2.3 In claim 6, two sensors are used, each having three sensitive axes. Said alterations are part of the standard practice of a person skilled in the art and the resulting advantages are easily foreseeable. Consequently, the subject matter of claim 6 does not involve an inventive step either.

2.2.4 The features of dependent claims 7 and 8 have already been used for the same purpose in an equivalent orientation-detecting device (see D2, column 6, lines 24 to 30 & figure 6 and D3, column 11, lines 1 to 45). It is obvious for a person skilled in the art to apply these features, with a corresponding effect, in an orientation-detecting device according to D1 and thereby arrive at an

orientation-detecting device according to claims 7 and 8.

2.2.5 The technical features in claims 9 and 10 are described in D3. The features of dependent claims 9 and 10 have already been used for the same purpose in an equivalent orientation-detecting device (see D3, column 11, lines 41 to 43). It is obvious for a person skilled in the art to apply these features, with a corresponding effect, in an orientation-detecting device according to D1 and thereby arrive at an orientation-detecting device according to claims 9 and 10.

2.2.6 The technical features in claims 11 and 12 are described in D1 (figure 3, n. 70 and claim 7).

2.2.7 In claim 13, a clock is used to synchronise the recording of the successive estimations of the orientation of the solid. Said alterations are part of the standard practice of a person skilled in the art and the resulting advantages are easily foreseeable. Consequently, the subject matter of claim 13 does not involve an inventive step either.

2.2.8 The technical features in claims 15 to 18 are described in D3.

3. Industrial applicability

Claims 1 to 18 are industrially applicable in the field of detecting the orientation of a solid.

****